

## **REMARKS**

The comments with regard to an election are not understood since claims 1 to 25 were canceled in the preliminary amendment. There is no election in this case.

Claims 26 and 28 to 31 have been amended. Claims 26 to 32 remain active in this application.

Claims 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 26 to 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Homma et al. (U.S. 6,798,050). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 requires, among other features, that the outer surface be planar. No such feature is found in Homma et al.

Claim 26 further requires that the planar outer surface be suitable to form metallurgical bonds without melting. No such feature is found in Homma et al.

Claims 27, 28 and 30 depend from claim 26 and therefore define patentably over Homma et al. for at least the reasons stated above with reference to claim 26.

In addition, claim 27 further limits claim 26 by requiring that the step of depositing be selected from a group consisting of sputtering, evaporating, and plating. No such combination is taught or suggested by Homma et al.

Claim 28 further limits claim 26 by requiring that the step of fabricating a planar outer surface of the added conductive layer comprise the step of depositing the at least one added conductive layer by electroless plating. No such combination is taught or suggested by Homma et al.

Claim 30 further limits claim 26 by requiring that the step of fabricating a planar outer surface of the added conductive layer comprise the step of depositing the at least one added conductive layer by using the method of support by islands of protective overcoat. No such combination is taught or suggested by Homma et al.

Claims 26 to 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 6,709,901). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The arguments presented above with reference to the rejection on Homma et al. applies and is incorporated by reference as to claims 26 to 28 and 30. The features discussed in connection with claim 26 are also found in claim 31 and, accordingly, the same argument applies and is incorporated by reference.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homma et al. or Yamazaki et al., both in view of Akram et al. (U.S. 6,617,687). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 depends from claim 26 and therefore defines patentably over the applied references since Akram et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies in Homma et al. and Yamazaki et al. as noted above.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(972) 917-4418 (Fax)